DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 343 95 TM 005 432

TITLE Evaluation Design for Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Basic Skills Group. Learning Div.
PUB DATE Mar 76
CONTRACT 400-76-0046
NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; Educational Objectives; *Evaluation Methods; Group Behavior; Instructional Systems; Participant Satisfaction; *Problem Solving; Program Evaluation; *Teachers; Teamwork; Training; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS Improving Teaching Competencies Program; Resource Allocation Management Plan

ABSTRACT

Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving is an instructional system currently under development by the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP) of Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL). In accordance with the Resource Allocation Management Plan (RAMP, 1975) of ITCP, this report presents a plan of evaluation activities for the interim milestone period in the development of the instructional system. Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving is designed for teachers, administrators and others to increase their ability to recognize and handle conflict due to differences of values and self-interest. It is intended to be a relatively structured, experience-based workshop designed to provide a variety of opportunities to explore situations of social conflict. The training is designed to provide conceptual awareness and experiential training in the following areas: social conflict, power, assertiveness, self-interests, interpersonal communication skills in conflict situations and "negotiative" problem solving skills. (Author/DEP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127343

EVALUATION DESIGN FOR SOCIAL CONFLICT AND NEGOTIATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM SP
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Social Conflict & Negotiative Problem Solving

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TM005 992

Improving Teaching Competencies Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Portland, Oregon 97204

EVALUATION DESIGN FOR SOCIAL CONFLICT AND NEGOTIATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

IMPROVING TEACHING COMPETENCIES PROGRAM

MARCH 1976

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204

March 1976

Published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation. The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-0046, with the Basic Skills Group/Learning Division of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 710 S.W. Second Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Evaluation	1
DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM	2
Workshop Content and Design	3
Objectives	4
Current Status of Development	5
EVALUATION DESIGN	7
Overview of the Evaluation Design	7
Need	8
Purposes, Goals and Objectives	8
Training Content and Strategies	13
Training Outcomes	13
Dissemination	24
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINES	30
REFERENCES	32
APPENDIX: Examples of Possible Procedures and Instruments	33
FIGURE 1: Relationship Between Developmental Tasks and Developmental Phases	6
FIGURE 2: Illustrative Hypothetical Tracing of One Participant's Responses to Activities Focusing on the Concept "Self-Interests" Over Time	38

INTRODUCTION

Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving is an instructional system currently under development by the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP) of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL). In accordance with the *Resource Allocation Management Plan (RAMP,* 1975) of ITCP, this report presents a plan of evaluation activities for the interim milestone period in the development of the instructional system.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The ITCP management plan *RAMP* provides for five stages of development for the *Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving* instructional system. These stages include the planning, pilot, interim, field test and outcome milestones. This document presents an evaluation design for the interim stage of development. Evaluation at the interim stage is designed primarily to provide information to help developers improve the instructional system.

Each stage of development has an accompanying evaluation with a somewhat different design because of the nature of the information needed by the developers at the various stages. In the case of the interim stage, the primary audience for the evaluation findings is the development team.

An additional function of this evaluation, however, is to present to decision makers at NWREL and the National Institute for Education (NIE) who are not directly involved in the development or evaluation of the instructional system, a summary of the status of the development of the instructional system and a summary of evaluation activites and findings which were provided to the developers during the interim stage.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEM

The material in this section reflects the development of this system through the pilot milestone (August 1975) with some modifications from more recent efforts.

Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving is an instructional system designed for teachers, administrators and others to increase their ability to recognize and handle conflict due to differences of values and self-interest. It is intended to be a relatively structured, experience-based workshop designed to provide a variety of opportunities to explore situations of social conflict. The training is designed to provide conceptual awareness and experiential training in the following areas: social conflict, power, assertiveness, self-interests, interpersonal communication skills in conflict situations and "negotiative" problem solving skills.

The following paragraphs are taken from the interim version of the instructional materials (Lohman and Wilson, 1975) to illustrate further the point of view of the developers and the meaning of the key concepts, "social conflict" and "negotiative problem solving."

> Social conflict is not neutral; it is not good; it is not bad. Conflict is both good and bad at the same time for human beings. That is, in any conflict situation one can find elements that we value as good, e.g., it may signal problems that need to be addressed, provide challenge, lead to more creative solutions, and help a group become cohesive. At the same time it is possible to find elements that we think of as "bad," e.g., it causes pain, it keeps people apart, results in violence. The training here is not designed to find ways to make conflict "good" or find ways to avoid those things which make conflict "bad." Rather, it provides opportunities to accept and understand conflict for what it is.

> Negotiative problem solving is defined as a process of dealing with social conflict, where the conflict is based on incompatible goals, values or interests. This process does not assume a consensus of ultimate goals, or that there is a single truth, or a one best-way, but accepts differences as legitimate and outcome as pluralistic. It does assume that the survival and interdependence of the relationship among the conflicting parties is necessary and acknowledged. It requires ability to use skills and procedures of clarifying self-interest, bargaining and negotiation.

WORKSHOP CONTENT AND DESIGN

The training format is a five-day structured, experience-based workshop. Emphasis is placed on an active learner style with minimal dependence on instructional leaders. The participants are presented with multiple opportunities to involve themselves in learning about conflict at personal and interpersonal levels. Participants are encouraged to establish and pursue their own learning goals and to support norms of openness to self-inquiry, risk taking and experimenting with new behavior. Opportunity is provided for personal reflection and integration, and for application to participant work settings. A negotiative problem solving (NPS) process is presented and eight conditions necessary to support negotiative problem solving in educational organizations are discussed.

Other substantive activities (theory papers, theory presentations) during the workshop focus on self-interest, personal feelings associated with conflict, types of conflict, interpersonal styles of coping with conflict, basic concepts of NPS, basic forms of power, assertiveness training, bargaining techniques, good-faith bargaining and dynamics of escalation/de-escalation.

The training system is built around a simulation. Following the ITCP "Do-Look-Learn" model of learning, participants have opportunities to experience dealing with conflict situations; to examine their

processes with the help of structured activities, to participate in feedback sessions from peers and to integrate their learnings.

OBJECTIVES

At this stage in the development of the instructional system the following objectives are the focus of the training:

1. Accepting conflict as a natural part of social reality
    a. Legitimation of own self-interests--regardless of value judgments (good/bad) about them
    b. Legitimation of others' self-interests--regardless of value judgments (good/bad) about them
    c. Accept feelings associated with conflict--anger, anxiety, withdrawal, competition, etc.
2. Increasing your ability to recognize self-interests in conflict situations
    a. Developing a usable personal definition of self-interest
    b. Identifying your own legitimate self-interests
    c. Identifying others' legitimate self-interests
    d. Observing the signs of emotional involvement and understanding the inevitability of emotions and feelings associated with these self-interests
3. Increasing your understanding of the phenomena of power
    a. Observing the forms and bases of power in a situation
    b. Developing a usable personal definition of the bases of power available to you in different situations
    c. Recognizing how our previous socialization affects our use and response to power
4. Observing and understanding the dynamics of conflict situations
    a. Observing styles of responding to conflict
    b. Recognizing styles in self/others
    c. Developing personal definitions of conflict styles

5. Understanding NPS model/process

   a. Collaborative/negotiative/competitive distinctions, assumptions, values; developing personal definitions

   b. Using in practice situations (steps, components)

   c. Reviewing previous experience for implications

6. Understand conditions necessary for using NPS model or process

   a. What they are

   b. How to bring them about

   c. Developing personal definitions of these conditions

7. Acquiring experience in NPS skills

   a. Diagnosing conflict situations

   b. Preparation: facts, position, team maintenance, role assignments, negotiation team constituency

   c. Using power to attain self-interest

   d. Negotiation skills:
      presenting position, backup, asserting self-interests
      paraphrase, nonverbals, probing
      good faith bargaining
      making concessions with rationale
      strategy (target, minimum) tactics
      making agreements

   e. Assessment

8. Integrating workshop learnings into own behavior

   a. Reinforcement/confrontation

9. Application to backhome

CURRENT STATUS OF DEVELOPMENT

The mangement plan for the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (see *PAMP*, 1975) divides the work flow for development and evaluation of an instructional system into five phases: planning, pilot, interim, field and outcome. Development activities differ somewhat according to the phase of development. These activities were explicated in the *Planning Milestone Report* (Lohman, Milczarek and Germann, 1974), and a truncated

revision of this plan has been followed. These activites are summarized in Figure 1. A more detailed discussion of each stage can be found in the *Planning Milestone Report*.

Figure 1: Relationship Between Developmental Tasks and Developmental Phases

Developmental Tasks	Phases of Development						
			Interim				
	Planning	Pilot	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Field Test	Outcome
To State Objectives	++	Δ	+	+	++	0	0
To Define Participant Entry Conditions	+	++	Δ	+	+	+	
To Specify Workshop Training Requirements	+	+	++	Δ	++	0	
To Design Training Activities	+	++	++	Δ	+	0	
To Develop Training Materials	+	++	++	Δ	+	0	
To Establish Sequence and Timing		+	++	Δ	++	0	
To Develop Instructional Strategies, Guide, Criteria for Trainer	+	+	+	++	Δ	+	0
To Design Installation/ Dissemination Activities	++	+	+	++	Δ	+	+

Δ Essential Development Work Completed
++ Major focus of Developmental Activity
\+ Some Attention, Revision
0 Slight Attention for Revision Purposes
▭ Tasks Completed to Date
▭ Tasks to be Completed by November 1976

OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION DESIGN

This evaluation design is presented in the context of an ongoing evaluation sequence. The design addresses, and is organized around, the five general evaluation issues outlined in the *Resource Allocation Management Plan* (1975). Some of the issues to be dealt with are recurrent carry-overs from previous work; others are addressed in detail for the first time.

For the reader a quick overview of the issues and their treatment over time follows:

Evaluation Issue	Primary Focus in This Design	Continuing Work	Future Work	Completed Work
Need and Justification				
a. Expert review				XX
b. Participant judgments		XX		
c. Changes in concpetualization and emphasis on conflict and negotiations in educational literature and products		XX		
Purposes, Goals, Objectives				
a. Expert review				XX
b. Identification of target population and workshop groupings		XX		
c. Participant responses, relationships between participant goals and training objectives		XX		
Training Content and Strategies				
a. Expert review				XX
b. Participant judgments		XX		
Training Outcomes				
a. Observations of participant responses during workshops	XX	XX		
b. Participant products & artifacts	XX	XX		
c. Followup study	XX	XX		
Dissemination				
a. Plans and strategies		XX	XX	
b. Pretraining materials and orientation package	XX			
c. Trainer role and requirements	XX	XX		
d. Cost analysis	XX	XX		

NEED

An expert review of the instructional system was conducted during the previous development-evaluation cycle. A summary of the findings of the panel concerning the social significance and educational system needs is included in the report of this review. That document is currently in final production.

At the end of each workshop, participants are asked to provide an assessment of the worth of the experience. The questionnaire eliciting this information will be revised to distinguish between desirability and essentiality. The current questions do not provide opportunities for the participant to respond in terms of his view of the needs existing in the educational system. Also, they do not obtain his perceptions of what might be ameliorated, if anything, should the conceptual framework and social-survival behaviors explored in this training become commonplace among educational practitioners.

Two extensive searches of the ERIC system for materials pertaining to key concepts such as conflict, negotiation, etc., have been conducted, one in March 1974 and one in January 1976. The report for the interim evaluation cycle will include an analysis of the material obtained in terms of changing attitudes, approaches and emphasis and the relationship of such changes to the conceptual and methodological content of the training experience.

PURPOSES, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Evaluative information concerning the goals and objectives has been provided through the expert review referenced above. In addition, two issues concerning goals and objectives are addressed in this design.

Identification of the Target Population and Workshop Groupings

There is some concern from the developers that trials to date have not involved a sufficiently broad and differentiated trainee group to adequately determine whether or not the training differentially facilitates attention to self-examination and learning in such population groups as strongly racial-identified teacher groups (e.g., blacks or Spanish surname), union vs. association affiliates, top school administrations and school boards vs. middle management and college professors. The differential dynamics introduced into the training situation by having a relatively homogeneous vs. a controlled mix of these population elements interacting together in a workshop have not been explored. At least two issues have a bearing on decisions about appropriate groupings.

First, it is likely that in a community where tension between groups was running very high and stereotypes were strongly polarized, an entirely new dynamic would be introduced into the workshop which could easily provide a collusive focus for avoiding the interpersonal learnings the system is designed for. In this situation one might find change occurring around weakening the stereotypes and reducing polarization as a trade-off for change in conceptual structure regarding the interpersonal situation. However, the potentiality for significant resistance and the need therefore for a highly skilled trainer to work through these dynamics with such a group of participants tends to preclude the use of groups from such polarized situations at this time.

Second, one of the major grouping problems is that of prior experience with other types of interpersonal skills training, especially ITCP systems. The last two workshops were conducted with groups in which the majority of members had, through their participation in *Research Utilizing Problem Solving (RUPS), Interpersonal Communications (IPC),*

Preparing Educational Training Consultants (PETC) or *Interpersonal Influence (INF)*, developed strong collusive norms against providing accurate observational data about what was going on. On the other hand, they also had a willingness to talk about interpersonal processes and possessed some skills for doing so. Without such willingness and skills there is inadequate group support for participants to learn from their experience. The system relies on members already having skills in this area; they are not provided in the instructions or practice sessions. In selecting target populations then, the trade-off is between having people with some prior experience also having developed collusive norms against change, and having inexperienced people whose resistance to open discussion of the interpersonal situation is likely to be high. Given the extent to which the training requires participants to examine dearly held assumptions about themselves and others, we suggest the disadvantages of collusive prior associations over the personal stress of requiring that the individual's first attempt at self-examination be so clearly focused on his central core of attitudes and beliefs about human affairs. (In the last workshop, the four participants who had the least experience with experientail learning had a great deal of difficulty focusing on their own behavior and got horribly enmeshed in an assortment of avoidance mechanisms which were debilitating for them as well as others. This is not to say that other members did not get similarly enmeshed, but rather that there is a relatively better chance of having enough participants who are willing to "go with" the experience and provide a supportive nucleus for others to model when most members have had this prior experience.)

With unlimited time and funds one could test a number of competing hypotheses concerning these issues empirically. In this cycle, however,

we are limited to two, and at most three, workshops given the time and monetary constraints. Using our best judgment of what population mix is most likely to pay off in terms of providing significant information for the most probable future uses of the instructional system, we expect to recruit and constitute workshop groups as follows: (a) approximately one-third are teachers or teacher negotiators identified racially or politically with strong vested interest groups (unions, teacher association representatives, black or Chicano, American Indian Movement groups, etc.); (b) approximately one-third are teachers or other public school line personnel not affiliated, or if affiliated, not actively involved in any strong vested interest group; (c) approximately one-third are school board and administrative personnel affiliated with "management" issues and concerns. These subgroups should be drawn across community lines so that pre-existing polarization and personal investment in conflict with opposing members in the actual community setting is to some extent defused and neutralized in the training context. Neither teacher-trainer personnel (e.g., college professors) nor educational R and D personnel should be recruited. Sufficient data on these populations already exists to provide comparative evidence.

The background questionnaire will be revised to ascertain the extent to which participants in the workshop match these specifications, and analysis of outcome will be related to the observed interactions and responses of these separate groups to each other and to the materials.

In the effort to recruit persons according to these specifications the criteria of prior participation in some form of interpersonal

skills training may or may not hold up. At minimum, no less than one-half of each subgroup of actual participants should have completed such training. The background questionnaire will be used to check the extent to which this criterion was fulfilled in each workshop.

Participant Assessment of Gains in Relation to the Objectives

Early in the workshop participants are asked to describe their own goals in the training. These written statements will be recorded on NCR paper and the duplicate copy used to analyze the relationship between participant entry goals and the workshop objectives and purposes. While this data is also pertinent to an analysis of the recruiting procedures and pre-workshop information materials, it also speaks to the question of what the population who select themselves into the training are really seeking compared to what is being offered.

At the end of the workshop participants have traditionally been asked to assess their satisfaction with various aspects of the experience. In this evaluation cycle a series of questions will be added which will ask the trainee to judge and describe his own progress in meeting the objectives vs. his learnings and satisfactions in other areas (meeting new people, working with the trainers, being involved in an interesting, meaningful experience, etc.). While this data will imply little or nothing concerning altering the objectives per se, it adds to the information pool of evidence concerning the source of trainee satisfaction with his experience and an estimate of the range of movement in the development of an expanded repertoire of social-survival behaviors that can be expected from various groups and types of participants.

TRAINING CONTENT AND STRATEGIES

In this evaluation cycle we will continue to provide information concerning participant judgments of the materials and methods consistent with evaluation work in preceding cycles and in other development activities. This information is obtained in the Final Questionnaire and the instrument and analysis will remain consistent with prior usage. Please see *Formative Evaluation Design for the Pilot Milestone* (1975) and *Pilot Milestone Report* (1975) for specific details.

TRAINING OUTCOMES

This section includes the majority of the new evaluation work to be initiated this cycle. The proposed evaluation strategies are based on the belief that the process of measuring effectiveness must be integrated into and consistent with (a) the development problem, i.e., the developers' process goals for the workshop strategies they design, (b) the participant change or learning process assumed by the instructional system and (c) expectations for participants in relation to the content of the system as reflected in the workshop objectives. The following sections elaborate these three areas and derive implications for measurement procedures.

Analysis of the Development Problem

The first section of this design describes the structure and objectives of the training materials. The training itself is, however, a total experience emerging from the participants' interaction with the materials, each other, the trainer and the structure. This experience involves (a) the actions of the trainers as they follow, or avoid following, the instructions in response to the design limits and participant responses; (b) the design limits which structure time,

materials, procedures, resources, etc., within and towards which participants are to act; (c) the actual performances of participants; (d) the past experiences and expectations of participants which provide limits and alternatives for performance.

The essence of the development problem (from which flow the critical evaluation dimensions) involves providing appropriate and timely activities which allow participants to:

1. Develop, clarify and expand their personal definitions of key interpersonal situations characterized by such labels as self-interest, power, conflict, collaboration, negotiation, etc.

2. Observe and identify, within specific events, their own and others' self-interests and use of power

3. Recognize when and how interpersonal situations, characterized by the label conflict, are related to legitimate differences in self-interests and goals

4. Act, within the interpersonal situations structured by the activities and materials of the workshop, in terms of their own self-interests and available resources

5. Describe their choices of actions (definitions, observations, identifications, performances) and their consequences

6. Generalize similarities and differences from these experiences to other situations

The activities, which in a training context allow participants these opportunities, are embodied in what can be referred to as "designed limits." Designed limits are defined as a clear set of directions to the participants which simultaneously provide a focus for using certain printed material or manipulative/expressive media, a time/space limitation and a clear procedure to follow.

For example, an "activity" may be "responding individually to a printed concept paper by first reading it and second completing an assessment form." Limits here, implicitly or explicitly, include:

1. The participants are to do their own individual work; not talk, discuss, produce a group report, reach consensus, copy another's work, ask the trainer to do their work for them, etc.

2. Participants are to read; not listen to a lecture, watch a film, walk around the room, take a nap, etc.

3. Participants are to read paper X; not the newspaper, not their notes from the last activity, not the term papers their student turned in last night, not somebody else's answers to the assessment form, etc.

4. Participants are to work now, in this place and in this time; not ten minutes from now, not at the end of the period, not out in the hall, not this evening at home, etc.

5. Participants are to respond in writing on a preset form; not talk to their neighbor, not tell the trainer out loud, not toss the paper in the wastebasket and forget it, not hiss, boo or cheer, not draw a picture, etc.

In this particular training, designed limits range from the example given to a fairly complex simulation in which subgroups of participants are given a relatively large amount of background information about a "role" within which they are to work with other subgroups (each of which has its own information concerning its "role") to arrive at some end state. Most "activities" are open-ended in the sense that once the limiting conditions are specified, the participants are free to respond in whatever way seems "best" to them, subject to the consequences of the limits. Participants thus "act out" in the workshop situation their established patterns of responses to interpersonal events. The substance of the training content (e.g., the interpersonal situations defined in the papers as "conflict," "co-optation," "manipulation," "power," etc.) emerge in the present momentary event in the actual behaviors, overt and covert, verbal and non-verbal, active or motionless, of the participants. Behavior in this context (and throughout this document) is defined to include not only physical motion or tangible artifacts, but also thought and feelings signaled by verbal and non-verbal responses, including silence and inactivity.

Participants do what they do, and in the training context are under some pressure to observe what they do and how it is that they do it. Such observations obviously may threaten to upset the trainee's organized conception of "how the world is," particularly "how I am in the world." Trainees can be observed to find and invent all kinds of wriggle room to deny and avoid self-observation of this type. The "success" of the training depends on the restrictions that the design places on "letting someone off the hook" prematurely.[1]

For evaluating training effectiveness our concern is with gathering evidence of change in such social-survival behaviors as personal definitions of the interpersonal situation; observation of own and others' behavior, self-interests, goals, power, etc., and expansion of acceptable alternative responses to these situations.

Analysis of the Change Process

Even in medicine the human organism is not a machine; it is not tinkerable with precisely predictable results. It is a complex socio-biological organism. When recent neurological evidence attests to the capacity for willing, conscious control of a single cell in a microscopic subsection of the spinal nerve column, it is folly to pretend there is no such thing as conscious and unconscious choice of what the organism will attend to with its sense organs and process through its brain. The organism has working for it a lifetime of experience in maintaining its survival mechanisms intact, and the person's view of "how I am in the world" is very much tied to meeting basic needs to survive in a social environment. Any training activity dealing with

---

[1] Prematurely meaning before they have a chance to see what it is that they are wriggling to get out of seeing.

interpersonal situations can be seen as an attempt to manipulate the social environment in order to affect social behavior. No single effort at such manipulation has the ghost of a chance of yielding "x" change in the social-survival behavior of all, or even most individuals, who come in contact with it.

What, then, can be said about how social-survival behavior does change; what process must take place?

1. It is essential that the person be allowed the conditions and time for a clear picture of his/her patterned responses, and his/her avoidances to emerge. (Such responses and avoidances include how he defines a situation, what he observes and responds to, what he ignores, how he organizes his thoughts and verbalizes them, orally, in writing, etc.)

2. It is necessary that the participant himself observe and describe, at least to himself, some portion of these responses and/or avoidances, at least once.

3. It is necessary that the participant "diagnose" and "evaluate" the responses he has described, to assess what benefits, "good results" etc., they have brought him, under which conditions and what discomforts, unfortunate side-effects, etc., they cause.

4. It is necessary that the participant decide when he is satisfied with "things as they are now" and when dissatisfied or curious enough to try some alternative.

5. When he tries something different, it is necessary that he compare the old and the "new" in terms of a variety of circumstances.

These conditions hold when one is dealing with change which is an expansion of the response-repertoire and an increasing control over potential responses to "fit" changing conditions and circumstances. We are calling this "internalized" learning. Other conditions hold when the "objective" is to substitute one response for another under all circumstances (this amounts to discarding one ritual for another), or when the "objective" is to overlay whatever behavior exists with a verbal screen. It is entirely possible that no matter how closely the training

design and conditions conform to the necessary conditions for the kind of change described above, some trainees will use the opportunity to "swap one routine for another" or simply learn a new language for talking about abstractions "outside" themselves.

Relationship Between Objectives of the System, the Development Problem and the Change Process

The objectives of the system as they are now stated (see page 4) divide into two types. Objectives 1 through 4 and their subparts imply change in the person's basic orientation to, observation of and evaluation of his own and others' patterned social-survival responses.

For example, to accept the legitimacy of another's self-interest, you must be clear about your own wants and needs in that particular interaction and be willing to act on a clear realization that the other person or persons, like you, have needs and wants and that these are not the same as yours. Acceptance is not merely lip service to the notion that every person is different, but actively working in the situation on the premise that the difference not only is, but should be, rather than holding to the premise that people "should" be alike or "should" agree. In this culture we are socialized that differences are threatening, wrong, the result of imperfect thought, laziness or stubbornness; we all deep down believe that there is "a" right answer. The belief in "a" correct "objective," "impersonal" reality is so strong that we spend much of our lives, wreck marriages and go to bed with headaches over arguing "who's right," rather than accepting the legitimacy of differing perceptions of reality. The first four objectives are focused on such changes in people's personal conceptions of interpersonal situations involving conflict.

The objectives listed as 5-7 are of a different order. These are "teaching" objectives in the traditional external-to-self form. Content material and training experiences are provided so that the trainee acquires a "language" and a set of "skills" prescribed or recommended by the "teacher." In this particular training, four responses are possible to this type of teaching. If trainees have learned to take responsibility for their own learning, if they know how to use a learning situation to their own advantage, if they are aware of and able to take care of their anxieties, then they are neither irrationally resistant nor do they simply copy "the teacher." In this case:

1. A person will show evidence of "internalizing" the learnings, e.g., building a more useful, personal conception of conflict phenomena.

If the trainees are basically embedded in the strong cultural norms that there is "a right answer" and that "learning" is "being taught," etc., a person may go one of three directions:

2. A person may focus attention on the "teaching," arguing "who's right," by heckling, intellectualizing, complaining, etc. (e.g., the "teacher's" "right answer" is "wrong").

3. A person may focus his attention on the "teaching" introjecting (swallowing whole) the content and dutifully copying the "teacher's" recommendations (e.g., the "teacher's" "right answer" is "right"). Such identification may, if practiced with energy, lead to the fourth type of response.

4. A person may get a glimmer and begin to observe and evaluate his social-survival behaviors, e.g., focusing his attention on the internalization process and evidencing some change relative to the first four objectives.

Most trainees can be expected to exhibit some behaviors indicative of each of the four types of responses, at different points, in different degrees and with different overall outcomes personally.

Evaluation and measurement must be geared to differentiating and describing these various response forms as they occur in the workshop.

The intent of the training is not to provide trainees with another copied set of motions which are no more than rituals for pacifying a threatening world, nor with another set of easy labels to misapply to self and others, nor to continue and reinforce a "who's right" approach to human affiars. That some trainees will undoubtedly manage to make these unintended intents the essence of the experience for themselves is unavoidable when pursuing a mass market. The question is not how many do, though if everyone does, that means trouble, but rather do those responses occur in random vs. highly predictable forms and times during the training. If random, then the trainees themselves are responsible, and that's the way it is; if predictable, then something in the system is responsible and change in training design, etc., becomes increasingly salient.

Methodological Implications

The preceding analysis has implications for the type of evaluation procedures to be used throughout the workshop. The learning activities of the instructional system are designed to facilitate the participants' internalization of the key concepts and skills of the negotiative problem solving model and expand his social-survival behaviors in identifying and responding to conflict situations. The evaluation procedures should facilitate this process as well as provide data concerning progress.

Given the fact that in this evaluation effort we are looking for evidence of change in personal conceptions of interpersonal situations, certain types of information become useful to distinguish between the four types of responses described above. This information can be obtained by observation of participants at critical points in the

change process as it occurs in the workshop (see page 18). In relation to a particular concept, e.g., self-interest, observations will be taken at the following points:[1]

1. Observe the participant's responses to the definitions (or conceptions) provided by the training. These occur in two forms.
   a. What he or she does when reading or listening to a description of that definition
   b. What he or she does when asked to respond verbally (orally or in writing) to the definition given
2. Observe the participant's responses when using the conception in an interpersonal situation.
   a. When not an actor in the situation
   b. As an actor in the situation
3. Observe the participant's responses when diagnosing or evaluating his or her performance or experience in the interpersonal situation.
   a. Describing the changes that have occurred in his or her thinking and their effect on his or her perceptions of social situations
   b. Writing his or her own definitions

For these observations, and in relation to each such specific "learning," we are looking for such signs of involvement in the change process as:

1. The participant's being actively involved in the task
2. The participant describing and using his or her own thoughts, feelings, observations, experiences in verbal responses
3. The participant's awareness of differences, in himself over time, between himself and others, between the authors and "others," between situations, conditions, events

---

[1] A specific example of the procedure for obtaining participants' responses and the method of interpreting these data are presented in the appendix.

4. The participant's awareness that he or she is the actor in defining the situation and in responding to it

5. The participant's awareness of the consequences and implications of defining situations one way compared to another

6. The participant's generalizations about similarities and differences between the training situation and other situations

It can be seen from this evaluation process that the structure one creates to obtain evidence of the change process is in itself a vehicle for the change. In this sense "measurement" is an integral part of, rather than an appendage to, the training effort. The data collecting questions and activities maintain, for the participant, a focus on the internalization process as it is occurring for him (or not o urring, as the case may be), increasing the power of the total training rather than distracting or detracting from it by introducing noise.

By repeating the structure described above during and following key learning sequences throughout the workshop, it is possible to obtain a time chart of change with which to judge which events precipitate self-observation and description for which participants, and where, for whom and under what conditions fluctuations occur, etc.

As each concept and skill is presented for participants to work with, one or more trained observers will record evidence of the participant's involvement with and/or avoidance of the task.

Participants will be asked to analyze interpersonal situations, some "created," some taken from tapes of actual interactions, where the concepts and skills are exemplified in use and/or misuse. Both their "products" and observational records of their responses while doing the task will be collected.

Participants will be asked, following their involvement in practice situations and simulations where their own use and misuse of the concepts and skills emerges, to describe their observation of their own and others' responses in terms of the concepts and skills, and to "evaluate" these performances as to results and consequences. Observations of performances during the activities will be recorded to keep track of significant responses which the trainee is unable or unwilling to observe, describe and evaluate.

Following a sequence of activities revolving around the identification, observation and use of a concept or skill, participants will be asked to describe where they are in their thinking and understanding and to write a definition from their own experience of the concept or a description of the skill. This measurement procedure will be repeated again for each of the key concepts and skills during the final day or day and a half of the workshop so that change and development towards internalization from initial work to final sequence can be analyzed.

In each of the above cases, the observer's record will be kept in descriptive form by participant and activity. The focus for these observations will be:

1. Indications of energy expenditure and involvement in the task
2. Indications of repetitive patterned responses and avoidance with respect to the key concepts and skills
3. Indications of shifts in these responses and/or avoidances
4. Indications of spontaneous use or observation of own or other's use and misuse, or avoidance of use, of key concepts and skills

Observation forms will be prepared prior to each workshop for each activity. At various times throughout each workshop at least two persons will be recording observations. The purpose of these double observations is to provide data for examining the issue of observer agreement. Examples of the types of materials to be used to elicit participants' products described above are found in the Appendix.

In addition to the data collected from participant artifacts and products and by the observers during the workshop, a followup questionnaire will be mailed to participants six to ten weeks following the workshop. Examples of the questions for the questionnaire are given in the Appendix.

DISSEMINATION

At this stage in the development process we are concerned with the collection of information, primarily of a documentary nature, which will enable specifications and plans to be drawn up and materials prepared for the eventual release of the instruction system and the transfer of responsibility for its use from the developers to the dissemination and marketing units.

Three areas are of particular concern: (a) recruiting materials and procedures, (b) trainer role requirements and (c) costs.

Recruiting

With this, as with any training focusing on the interpersonal situation and the expansion of social survival behaviors, it is critical that trainees enter the experience with as few preconceptions which will "lead them astray" as possible. By "leading astray" we refer to such conditions as inappropriate goals and expectations, promises of results which cannot be met and the type of huckstering

which tells the participant, "it's good for you." Past experience indicates that participants who come to such training having been "convinced" or "talked into it," whose expectations are widely discrepant from the actual experience or who have been led to expect specific outcomes, are likely to experience resentment and to respond to the disconfirmation in ways which prevent them from becoming involved in what the experience actually does provide.

While the written descriptions and materials informing potential participants about the workshop are and have been closely monitored by the developers, there are, in the interval between initial inquiry and final arrival at the workshop site, any number of informal and verbal contacts concerning arrangements, recruiting, etc. which are less subject to prior control of language used in responding to questions, etc. In this cycle we will be paying particular attention to indications that something is amiss. The coordinator of dissemination for the program will be asked to keep a record of contacts and to describe the kinds of questions asked concerning content, objective, outcomes and experiences of the training, as well as notes on his/her responses to these questions. This material will be used in preparing orientation materials for purchasers and users.

During the first day of the workshop the observer will be recording indications that any participant has arrived with expectations seriously out of line with the purposes and intents of the workshop. In addition, the first activity of participants identifying their own learning goals and interests for the workshop yields written statements which will be assessed for discrepancies from the stated descriptions and objectives. Where specific individuals are found to have highly discrepant expectations, we will attempt to

obtain from them or from the on-site workshop coordinator, information concerning how they found out about the opportunity, from whom and under what conditions. This information will be used in constructing the orientation materials.

Trainer Role Requirements

Prior to this cycle all workshops have been led by the developers with the focus of working out appropriate training activities (designed limits) and gathering observational and participant response data concerning the inputs and instructions necessary to respond adequately to resistance, avoidance, time and structure needs. In the role of trainer, the developers have used their own experience, knowledge and resources to respond to the dynamics of the training situation. Formative evaluation has concentrated on documenting these dynamics and the developers' responses. At this stage in the development process the emphasis shifts to translating the developers' spontaneous responses to the ongoing situation into a duplicable structure of written inputs, instructions and trainee focused activities which remove the trainer from the role of experienced expert in diagnosis of the ongoing dynamics and decrease the necessity for him/her to have in his/her spontaneous response repertoire a wide range of social-survival and teaching skills. For example, in all previous cycles there has been heavy reliance on trainer-led debriefing reviews of actual trainee behaviors (actions, feelings, thoughts, avoidances, etc.) as the mechanism for developing trainee observation skills and integration. The task in this development cycle is to create activities which allow trainees to accomplish these tasks while working individually and/or in small groups.

The evaluation problem is that of ascertaining whether or not these activity designs and their implementation by non-developer trainers do the job. Based on observations of the critical elements in what the developers did spontaneously, the following criteria will be used to assess this question:

1. Does the non-developer trainer follow and use the directions given him to guide the workshop participants clearly and precisely?

2. Does the non-developer trainer hold to the design limits and workshop materials in responding to questioning from participants concerning directions, definitions of concepts, etc.?

3. Does the non-developer trainer avoid being drawn into discussions of "training issues," of abstractions and generalizations about the concepts, theory, etc., not tied to specific events in the workshop, etc.?

4. Does the non-developer trainer distinguish between complaints which arise out of the inherent difficulties and pains of learning (e.g., trainees complaining about time, not enough breaks, etc., when they are in fact free to take care of their needs for thinking time, and of their physiological needs as they occur) and situational conditions which require adaptation (e.g., an announcement that half of the participant group must attend a faculty meeting at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday)?

5. Are trainees able to use the activities and directions given to conduct "on task" discussions of their observations and experiences during preceding practice activities?

6. Are trainees able to use the directions, inputs and artifacts produced for use in such discussions to identify limits they have placed on themselves in responding to their self-interests and observing the dynamics of the interpersonal situations emerging during preceding training activities?

The primary source of information for answering these questions will be the skilled observer's documentary record of the behaviors observed during the workshop. In addition, tape recordings of the trainer's directions and interactions with the "group as a whole" will be kept to match performance against the written instructions.

Participant artifacts, such as summaries of group discussions for report out events will also be collected. In each of the first two workshops one of the developers will act as co-trainer and support person for the novice trainer. His or her experiential judgments of the revisions needed in directions, inputs, materials, etc., for each activity will, of course, be the backstop for testing the implications of these data both for revisions and for the creation of orientation materials for future trainers.

The report of this documentary evidence, its analysis and implications will take the form of a descriptive analytic symmary in the final report. Given the constraints that we have only two workshops to work with and that the development of the trainer instructional manual is in its shakedown stage, an experimental test involving trainers of different skill levels working with different types of populations (strangers vs. an intact work-related group, for example) is not feasible at this time.

Cost Analysis

The coordinator of dissemination and field installation for Program 100 will be asked to keep a record of costs incurred in setting up the workshops in this cycle, including phone and travel costs, problems met and negotiated, tradeoffs necessary and time involved. The key contact person in each site will be asked to write a letter or memo describing the trials and tribulations experienced at his end in making the workshop a functioning reality. These documents will be summarized across the three workshops to provide a description of minimum conditions for getting a workshop underway.

Publisher estimates will be sought and actual materials and trainer costs for each workshop kept so that a statement of minimum and maximum costs which any user might expect may be written.

Participants will be asked to respond to a series of questions concerning the cost to them of attendance. These questions will be asked in the followup mailing. The questions of concern include:

1. What arrangements did the trainee have to make to get the amount of time free to participate; what did this cost him in work overload on return, etc.?

2. How were his expenses paid, e.g., reimbursed by district, out-of-pocket, etc., and round figure total cost?

3. What discomforts did he experience during training, and were the gains experienced sufficient to offset the cost?

Responses will be summarized to produce a description of the range within which potential participants can anticipate their costs to fall.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES AND TIME LINES

EVALUATION ISSUE	ACTIVITIES TO BE COMPLETED	TIME LINE
Need and Justification		
Participant judgments:	Revise Final Questionnaire	March-April
	Administer	May workshop
	Analysis	June
	Write draft section of final report and compile final tables	July
ERIC search analysis:	Read and review materials	April-May
	Write draft summary for report	June
Purposes, Goals, Objectives		
Identification of target populations, grouping procedures:	Selection sites and recruitment of participant groups	Ongoing
	Revision of Background Questionnaire	March
	Observation of workshop, effects of group identifications, prior training experiences	May-August
	Analysis of effects	June-October
	Tabulation and writing report	October-November
Participant assessment of goals in relation to objectives:	Revision of instruments	March-April
	Administration	May workshop
	Analysis of relationship between participant goals and workshop objectives	June
	Write draft for November report	July
Training Content and Strategies		
Participant judgments of materials and methods:	Administration of existing Final Questionnaire	May-August
	Tabulation and writing	October-November
Training Outcomes		
Observation of participant responses during training:	Development of forms	March-April
	First workshop use	May
	Refinement and revision	May-June
	Second and possible third use	July-August
	Analysis	May-September
	Tabulation and report writing	October-November
Participant products and artifacts:	Development of forms	March-April
	First workshop use	May
	Refinement and revision	May-June
	Second and possible third use	July-August
	Analysis	May-September
	Tabular presentation and report writing	October-November

EVALUATION ISSUE	ACTIVITIES TO BE COMPLETED	TIME LINE
Training Outcomes (cont.)		
Followup Questionnaire:	Revision	April-May
	Administration	July-October
	Analysis	August-November
	Final report writing	November
Dissemination		
Pretraining materials:	Documentation of oral and non-prepared contacts	March-July
	Observation and personal interview of trainees with discrepant expectations	May-July
	Analysis of implications for orientation package	June-July
	Products of orientation materials	August
Trainer role and requirements:	Observations of co-trainers	May-October
	Analysis of data & prepare implications for training trainers	June-November
Cost analysis:	Documentation of Lab costs in site negotiations	March-July
	Request to on-site coordinators concerning costs	May-June
	Publisher estimates	October
	Documentation of material costs per workshop	May-August
	Reporting findings	November

REFERENCES

Emory, Ruth and René Pino. *Interpersonal Influence (INF)*, Interim Version. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. 1973.

Emory, Ruth and René Pino. *Preparing Educational Training Consultants (PETC-I): Skills Trainers Workshop Instructional Strategies.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. 1972.

Emory, Ruth and René Pino. *Preparing Educational Training Consultants (PETC-II): Consultation.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. January 1975.

Improving Teaching Competencies Program. *Proposal and Resource Allocation Management Plan (RAMP).* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. October 1975.

Jung, Charles, Ruth Emory and René Pino. *Interpersonal Communications (IPC).* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. 1971.

Jung, Charles, Ruth Emory and René Pino. *Preparing Educational Training Consultants (PETC-III): Organizational Development.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. January 1975.

Jung, Charles, Ruth Emory and René Pino. *Research Utilizing Problem Solving (RUPS).* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. May 1973.

Lohman, J. E., G. Milczarek and C. Germann. *Planning Milestone Report for Conflict and Negotiations in Education Work Unit.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. March 1974.

Lohman, John E. and Gretchen G. Wilson. *Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. July 1975.

Milczarek, Gary J. *Pilot Milestone Report for Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving.* Portland, Oregon. November 1975.

Appendix

EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE
PROCEDURES AND INSTRUMENTS

AN EXAMPLE OF THE OBSERVATION PROCEDURES

Suppose, for example, that we are interested in finding out how the participant is responding to a series of experiences designed to develop, clarify and expand personal definitions of the concept of self-interest. The following procedures are recommended to obtain the desired information about the participants' responses:

1. Observe his responses to the definition provided by the training. These occur in two forms, first what he does when he reads or listens to a description of that definition. Observation would focus on body movements, verbal asides, signalling, etc., which pertain to expenditure of energy on the tasks. Does he wiggle nervously in his chair, gaze abstractedly out the window, choose that time to light a cigarette, fiddle with papers, catch another's eye, whisper with a neighbor? These actions tend to indicate some resistance to or avoidance of involvement and expenditure of energy. Does he sit limp and motionless, leaning forward, alert, or pushed back, keeping distance between his body and the words coming toward him?

   The second form is what he does when asked to respond verbally (orally or in writing) to the definition given. Does he talk about <u>his</u> response to the definition, his thoughts, feelings, assumptions, questions, etc.? Does he talk about language as an abstraction, "the concept is..." etc.? Does he talk about the authors, the activity, external conditions, e.g., punctuation, grammar, "they..." etc.? Does he indicate any awareness of a discrepancy between cultural definitions and the author's definition? Does he describe any elements of surprise, personal recognition, discomfiture in his initial or considered thoughts about the subject? Does he argue with the definition on intellectual or personal grounds? Does he simply accept and use the author's words without energy investments?

2. Observe how he responds to being asked to use the concept to define interpersonal situations, first when he is not an actor and second when he is an actor in that situation. Does he focus on "what the author means" to the exclusion of "what <u>I</u> mean"? Does he argue with or become critical of the task or some aspect of it? Does he retreat to confusion, wanting and waiting for someone else to do the work? Does he "go through the motions" spending his energy on socializing, off-task talk, etc.? Does he pay attention to specific conditions, circumstances, etc., or treat the material, event, as representative of most or all situations? Does he make any reference to how he sees things now, compared to "before"?

3. Ask him to respond to his experiences as actor in the sequence of training activities:

   a. To describe his responses to the experiences, the changes which have occurred in his thinking and their effects on his perceptions of social situations

   b. To write his own definition

   While doing these tasks is his energy invested in it or do his responses indicate resistance to or avoidance of involvement? Does he write in the first or third person, describe specific events and conditions or respond in global generalities? Does he talk about his own personal experiences, thoughts, feelings, or about "they," "all of us," "we," "it," etc.? Does he parrot or attempt to duplicate the author's definition; does he write an abstract "dictionary" definition or does his definition contain a differentiated description of the relationships subsumed under the label in specific interpersonal situations meaningful to him?

A specific example may help clarify the procedure for obtaining participant responses as well as the wholistic method of interpreting these data in terms of the four response patterns of concern:

> On the first morning of the workshop, participants are introduced to the concept "self-interest." They are given written material describing the objectives and procedures of the workshop. They are then given material defining the concept "self-interest." They are asked to write statements describing at least three of their own personal "self-interests" in attending and participating in this particular workshop. They are told that they will use these statements, by publicly displaying them, and to select teams who will work together throughout the workshop. They are asked to be as specific and personally accurate as possible since they will be forming teams of persons whose specific needs and interests in learning from this experience are similar.
>
> The context for analyzing the written products thus includes: (a) the completeness of the statement, (b) personal referent, e.g., use of first person singular pronouns, relating workshop objective to backhome and personal growth needs and issues, etc., (c) specificity, uniqueness, e.g., a general human "need," such as "adequate shelter" cannot assist in discriminating between persons of like and different specific learning needs and desires in the workshop context, (d) relevance to the workshop context, e.g., "adequate shelter" may be a "real" need, but unless the person draws a specific relationship between the workshop experience and this general need, neither he nor others can make rational,

informed choices about teams. In addition, observational data concerning what participants are doing as they work on the writing assignment serves to confirm or modify the analysis of the written products. Thus, someone whose written statements consist of brief general phrases may be observed to spend most of his writing time engaging in chatter, drinking coffee or otherwise not working, or he may be observed to be arguing with the trainers, showing signs of disagreement or disgust, etc. Such observations would serve to differentiate passive vs. active avoidance and resistance to being involved and focusing his energy on the task. These specific, actual written responses obtained from the last workshop, and their interpretation, serve to illustrate both the nature of the written products obtained and their analysis:

Response: "Learn to:

1. Understand options of coping with behaviors in conflict situations

2. Diagnose conflict situations accurately in terms of power bases.

3. Use skills in negotiations."

Analysis: The language of this statement is taken almost verbatim from the initial paper given participants listing the objectives of the workshop. The participant does not use the personal pronoun or otherwise indicate any specifics concerning personal situations or needs that these wishes are related to. Unless other evidence collected at about this time during the workshop indicates otherwise, the response appears to be direct copying of the "teacher."

Response: "1. Basic health needs

2. Professional growth

3. Financial security"

Analysis: These brief phrases list needs general to most human beings. The participant does not use personal pronouns, does not write complete sentences, does not include any specifics indicating how these general needs are related in any way to participating in this workshop. Given the context it is difficult to see how the statements are usable in selecting team members, or how these needs are to be served or satisfied by participating in the workshop.

Observational evidence indicates the person spent the majority of the time allotted to writing in talking to his neighbors and twice left his task to get coffee or leave the room. This response appears to indicate unwillingness or inability to get involved in the task at the level of energy investment required. The participant can be said to be avoiding the learning task at this moment.

Response: "1. Increase my ability to deal with power struggles between management and various collective bargaining groups.

2. Increase my ability to prevent conflict from getting out of hand at the bargaining table.

3. Deal with the problem of bargaining 'in the sunshine.'"

Analysis: This response uses the language of the workshop objectives in unique and specific ways, specifying situations and conditions of personal use. The participant uses the first person pronoun. Unless there is other evidence to the contrary, the response tends to indicate this participant was able to identify specific personal "self-interests" in the context of the workshop and the immediate task. The evidence suggests internalized use of the concept at this time and in this task.

It is important to note that in this example the analysis includes not only the specific words written, but also the written style, the context and observations of the actual behavioral situation in which the writing was produced. The process to be employed is wholistic, not mechanistic, involving generalization from the totality of the data rather than reduction into minute bits of information to be "summed" by statistical or other mechanical procedures after all reductions have been completed. Examples of current drafts (not final form) of instructions and questions which may potentially be used to elicit

written artifacts in conjunction with the training activities are found on pages 40 and 41 in the Appendix.

Across workshop events, the analysis of written products and observer descriptions will be used to construct charts of each participant's responses. See Figure 2. for an example of such a chart.

Charts similar to this illustrative one can be constructed from the type of information to be collected and the form of analysis to be done for all participants, for specific key concepts and across activities. These charts will be used

1. To determine participants' progress and movement along a continuum of increasing differentiation and internalization

2. To ascertain whether specific response patterns during particular activities result from the particular interpersonal styles and conceptual organizations of individual participants or are tied in predictable ways to the structure of the task. For example, does a specific activity result in active resistance for a large proportion of participants who have not exhibited this response in other activities? Does a different activity result in a large proportion of uninvolved responses (perhaps indicating a timing problem), an increase in the number of participants who exhibit responses analyzable as self-examination, etc.?

3. To determine whether or not there are differences in responses to, and/or movement over time in regard to, different key concepts. For example, do the individual charts for activities dealing with self-interest mirror or depart from the charts for activities dealing with conflict, the concept of negotiation, the explication and use of bargaining skills, etc.?

The use of such longitudinal and contextually based material will allow judgments of outcome in terms of when, where and why change and movement takes place, as well as the type of change which occurs. Where movement does not occur, the data needed to judge what needs to happen is available in usable form so that neither the evaluator nor the developer is left in the position of having to say "it may be X, Y or Z that is going on."

Figure 2.

Illustrative Hypothetical Tracing of One Participant's Responses to Activities Focusing on the Concept "Self-Interests" Over Time

Response Pattern	Observed response to reading self-interest paper	First self-interest product	Observed response during team discussion	Written self-interest product, Round 1, NOG	Identification of behaviors indicating conflict of interests in simulation, Round 1	Observation of own self-interests, Round 2	Identification of others' self-interests Round 2	Observation of responses to discussion of conflicting interests after Round 2	Description of self-interests, Round 3	Observation and identification of behaviors indicating conflicting self-interests, Round 3	Observed responses to self-interest discussion following Round 3	Written personal definition of self-interest, Day 4
Evidence indicates internalized use (Response #1, p. 19)								X				
Evidence indicates self-examination and/or process observation (Response #4, p. 19)					X		X					X
Evidence indicates copying (Response #3, p. 19)		X		X		X			X			
Evidence indicates low energy expenditure, lack of involvement (Passive avoidance aspect of Response #2, p. 19)	X		X							X		
Evidence indicates active resistance (Active avoidance aspect of Response #2, p. 19)					X							

EXAMPLES OF POTENTIAL PARTICIPANT PRODUCTS TO BE USED TO COLLECT DATA DURING TRAINING

The examples which follow fall in the category of assessing the participants' development of personal definitions of and ability to observe the operation of key concepts in the dynamics of ongoing situations. Other instruments, to be developed, will use examples somewhat similar to the one used in describing a possible followup questionnaire item in the preceding section.

Example 1:

a. You have just participated in a practice round of a negotiation simulation. Please describe at least one thing you noticed about self-interests during the past two hours. Give as much detail about the situation, your thoughts and feelings, and what you and others actually did, as you can.

(Space for response)

b. As you think now about the situation as you experienced and described it above, what would you say were the benefits or good results of what happened; in what way were you uncomfortable with or what were the unforeseen or unexpected consequences of what happened?

(Space for response)

c. All in all how satisfied are you with where you are right now in thinking about your own and others' self-interests?

(Space for response)

Example 2:

a. You have just completed an assessment form and discussion concerning your conceptualization of conflict. Please describe at least one thing you noticed about where you are in your thinking and orientation right now. Give as much detail as you can about what you noticed and why it is important to you.

(Space for response)

b. As you think about it now, what do you see as the benefits, good results, of holding on to your current thinking about conflict; what do you see as the disadvantages or possible unintentional consequences?

(Space for response)

c. What do you think now would be the consequences of changing your thinking?

(Space for response)

Example 3:

a. You have just finished Round 1 in the NOG simulation of negotiation. Please describe at least one thing you noticed about conflict during this round that you weren't as aware of before as you are now. Try to be as specific as possible in describing the situation, what happened and what you were thinking and feeling at the time.

(Space for response)

b. Based on your experience at this time, what would you like to do and what would you like to avoid doing in the next negotiation round?

(Space for response)

FOLLOWUP QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE ITEMS

Among the questions to be addressed in the followup instrument are:

1. Can trainees recognize and describe situations in their own lives when they have and have not accurately identified competing self-interests as the underlying basis of difficulty in interpersonal and interorganizational relations?

2. Can trainees recognize and describe specific gains and losses attendant on their clarity or lack of clarity about the underlying nature of actual conflict situations they have faced?

3. Can trainees recognize and describe situations in their own lives where they have differentiated cooperation from co-optation and manipulation, self-interest from selfishness, authoritarianism from taking responsibility for giving directions?

4. When asked to describe a situation where someone else or some other group got what they wanted at his expense, is the trainee clear about what choices he made that allowed that to occur, or does he "blame" the "other guy," outside influences, etc.?

One potential format for such an instrument is to provide an example and ask the respondent to describe a similar experience and answer questions about it. For example, take the last question above,

someone gaining at your expense; one way of concretely dealing with this question follows:

1. Many situations where people have conflicting self-interests leave someone feeling mistreated.

   Example: In a small private school where teachers work in teams, there is considerable competition between teams for approval of plans which involve use of space resources, additional costs or workload reductions. In a series of recent administrative decisions where two teams had each requested use of the same resources, assignment of a particular aide to the team, expenditure of about the same dollar amounts on art supplies, placement of a particular child in the classroom, etc. One team had consistently "won." In a team meeting subsequent to the last "defeat" the "losing" team members were saying: T_1. "Susie really fights for what she wants. She just never budges an inch just because we want the same thing. I'd rather give in. I don't like the feeling of winning out over someone I like and respect." T_2. "Yeah, but I sure feel we're getting the raw end of the stick." T_1. "It just isn't fair. I feel like we're not getting the kind of support we need and deserve from the administration."

2. Thinking about your own experiences since the workshop, describe a situation where a similar conflict of interest left you feeling abused and unfairly treated. If you have not had any such experience since the workshop, say why you think this is so.

   (Space for response)

   a. As you think now about the experience you described, what do you think contributed to the fact that someone gained at your expense?

      (Space for response)

   b. What part, if any, did you play in determining the outcome?

      (Space for response)

   c. Is this type of experience unusual or fairly typical of the way things go for you day by day? In what way?

      (Space for response)